arXiv:1412.7465v2 [math.AC] 4 Nov 2016

PRESENTATIONS OF RINGS WITH A CHAIN OF SEMIDUALIZING MODULES

ENSIYEH AMANZADEH AND MOHAMMAD T. DIBAEI

Abstract. Inspired by Jorgensen et. al., it is proved that if a Cohen-Macaulay local ring R with dualizing module admits a suitable chain of semidualizing R-modules of length n, then $R \cong Q/(I_1 + \cdots + I_n)$ for some Gorenstein ring Q and ideals $I_1, \cdots, I_n$ of Q; and, for each $\Lambda \subseteq [n]$, the ring $Q/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda} I_l)$ has some interesting cohomological properties . This extends the result of Jorgensen et. al., and also of Foxby and Reiten.

1. Introduction

Throughout R is a commutative noetherian local ring. Foxby [4], Vasconcelos [17] and Golod [8] independently initiated the study of semidualizing modules. A finite (i.e. finitely generated) R-module C is called *semidualizing* if the natural homothety map $\chi^R_C : R \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_R(C, C)$ is an isomorphism and $\mathrm{Ext}^{\geqslant 1}_R(C, C) = 0$ (see [10, Definition 1.1]). Examples of semidualizing R-modules include R itself and a dualizing R-module when one exists. The set of all isomorphism classes of semidualizing R-modules is denoted by $\mathfrak{G}_0(R)$, and the isomorphism class of a semidualizing R-module C is denoted $[C]$. The set $\mathfrak{G}_0(R)$ have caught attentions of several authors; see, for example [6], [3], [12] and [14]. In [3], Christensen and Sather-Wagstaff show that $\mathfrak{G}_0(R)$ is finite when R is Cohen-Macaulay and equicharacteristic. Then Nasseh and Sather-Wagstaff, in [12], settle the general assertion that $\mathfrak{G}_0(R)$ is finite. Also, in [14], Sather-Wagstaff studies the cardinality of $\mathfrak{G}_0(R)$.

Each semidualizing R-module C gives rise to a notion of reflexivity for finite R-modules. For instance, each finite projective R-module is totally C-reflexive. For semidualizing R-modules C and B, we write $[C] \trianglelefteq [B]$ whenever B is totally C-reflexive. In [7], Gerko defines chains in $\mathfrak{G}_0(R)$. A *chain* in $\mathfrak{G}_0(R)$ is a sequence $[C_n] \trianglelefteq \cdots \trianglelefteq [C_1] \trianglelefteq [C_0]$, and such a chain has length n if $[C_i] \neq [C_j]$ whenever $i \neq j$. In [14], Sather-Wagstaff uses the length of chains in $\mathfrak{G}_0(R)$ to provide a lower bound for the cardinality of $\mathfrak{G}_0(R)$.

It is well-known that a Cohen-Macaulay ring which is homomorphic image of a Gorenstein local ring, admits a dualizing module (see [16, Theorem 3.9]). Then Foxby [4] and Reiten [13], independently, prove the converse. Recently Jorgensen et. al. [11], characterize the Cohen-Macaulay local rings which admit dualizing modules and non-trivial semidualizing modules (i.e. neither free nor dualizing).

In this paper, we are interested in characterization of a Cohen-Macaulay ring R which admits a dualizing module and a certain chain in $\mathfrak{G}_0(R)$. We prove that, when a Cohen-macaulay ring R

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 13D05, 13D07.

Key words and phrases. dualizing, semidualizing, suitable chain, totally C-reflexive.

with dualizing module has a *suitable chain* in $\mathfrak{G}_0(R)$ (see Definition 3.1) of length n, then there exist a Gorenstein ring Q and ideals $I_1, \cdots, I_n$ of Q such that $R \cong Q/(I_1 + \cdots + I_n)$ and, for each $\Lambda \subseteq [n] = \{1, \cdots, n\}$, the ring $Q/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda} I_l)$ has certain homological and cohomological properties (see Theorem 3.9). Note that, this result gives the result of Jorgensen et. al. when $n = 2$ and the result of Foxby and Reiten in the case $n = 1$. We prove a partial converse of Theorem 3.9 in Propositions 3.15 and 3.16.

2. Preliminaries

This section contains definitions and background material.

Definition 2.1. ([10, Definition 2.7] and [15, Theorem 5.2.3 and Definition 6.1.2]) Let C be a semidualizing R-module. A finite R-module M is *totally C-reflexive* when it satisfies the following conditions:

(i) the natural homomorphism $\delta^C_M : M \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_R(\mathrm{Hom}_R(M, C), C)$ is an isomorphism, and
(ii) $\mathrm{Ext}^{\geqslant 1}_R(M, C) = 0 = \mathrm{Ext}^{\geqslant 1}_R(\mathrm{Hom}_R(M, C), C)$.

A totally R-reflexive is referred to as totally reflexive. The G_C-dimension of a finite R-module M, denoted $\mathrm{G}_C\text{-dim}_R(M)$, is defined as

$$\mathrm{G}_C\text{-dim}_R(M) = \inf \left\{ n \geqslant 0 \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{l} \text{there is an exact sequence of } R-\text{modules} \\ 0 \to G_n \to \cdots \to G_1 \to G_0 \to M \to 0 \\ \text{such that each } G_i \text{ is totally } C-\text{reflexive} \end{array} \right\}.$$

Remark 2.2. [2, Theorem 6.1] Let S be a Cohen-Macaulay local ring equipped with a module-finite local ring homomorphism $\tau : R \to S$ such that R is Cohen-Macaulay. Assume that C is a semidualizing R-module. Then $\mathrm{G}_C\text{-dim}_R(S) < \infty$ if and only if there exists an integer $g \geqslant 0$ such that $\mathrm{Ext}^i_R(S, C) = 0$ for all i, $i \neq g$, and $\mathrm{Ext}^g_R(S, C)$ is a semidualizing S-module; when these conditions hold, one has $g = \mathrm{G}_C\text{-dim}_R(S)$.

2.3. Define the order $\trianglelefteq$ on $\mathfrak{G}_0(R)$. For $[B], [C] \in \mathfrak{G}_0(R)$, write $[C] \trianglelefteq [B]$ when B is totally C-reflexive (see, e.g., [14]). This relation is reflexive and antisymmetric [5, Lemma 3.2], but it is not known whether it is transitive in general. Also, write $[C] \triangleleft [B]$ when $[C] \trianglelefteq [B]$ and $[C] \neq [B]$. For a semidualizing C, set

$$\mathfrak{G}_C(R) = \big\{[B] \in \mathfrak{G}_0(R) \;\big|\; [C] \trianglelefteq [B]\big\}.$$

In the case D is a dualizing R-module, one has $[D] \trianglelefteq [B]$ for any semidualizing R-module B, by [9, (V.2.1)], and so $\mathfrak{G}_D(R) = \mathfrak{G}_0(R)$.

If $[C] \trianglelefteq [B]$ then $\mathrm{Hom}_R(B, C)$ is a semidualizing and $[C] \trianglelefteq [\mathrm{Hom}_R(B, C)]$ ([2, Theorem 2.11]). Moreover, if A is another semidualizing R-module with $[C] \trianglelefteq [A]$, then $[B] \trianglelefteq [A]$ if and only if $[\mathrm{Hom}_R(A, C)] \trianglelefteq [\mathrm{Hom}_R(B, C)]$ ([5, Proposition 3.9]).

Theorem 2.4. [7, Theorem 3.1] *Let B and C be two semidualizing R-modules such that $[C] \trianglelefteq [B]$. Assume that M is an R-module which is both totally B-reflexive and totally C-reflexive, then the composition map*

$$\varphi : \mathrm{Hom}_R(M, B) \otimes_R \mathrm{Hom}_R(B, C) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_R(M, C)$$

is an isomorphism.

Corollary 2.5. [7, Corollary 3.3] *If* $[C_n] \trianglelefteq \cdots \trianglelefteq [C_1] \trianglelefteq [C_0]$ *is a chain in* $\mathfrak{G}_0(R)$*, then one gets*

$$C_n \cong C_0 \otimes_R \operatorname{Hom}_R(C_0, C_1) \otimes_R \cdots \otimes_R \operatorname{Hom}_R(C_{n-1}, C_n).$$

Assume that $[C_n] \lhd \cdots \lhd [C_1] \lhd [C_0]$ is a chain in $\mathfrak{G}_0(R)$. For each $i \in [n]$ set $B_i = \operatorname{Hom}_R(C_{i-1}, C_i)$. For each sequence of integers $\mathbf{i} = \{i_1, \cdots, i_j\}$ with $j \geqslant 1$ and $1 \leqslant i_1 < \cdots < i_j \leqslant n$, set $B_{\mathbf{i}} = B_{i_1} \otimes_R \cdots \otimes_R B_{i_j}$. ($B_{\{i_1\}} = B_{i_1}$ and set $B_\emptyset = C_0$.)

In order to facilitate the discussion, we list some results from [14]. We first recall the following definition.

Definition 2.6. Let C be a semidualizing R-module. The *Auslander class* $\mathcal{A}_C(R)$ with respect to C is the class of all R-modules M satisfying the following conditions.

(1) The natural map $\gamma_M^C : M \longrightarrow \operatorname{Hom}_R(C, C \otimes_R M)$ is an isomorphism.
(2) $\operatorname{Tor}_{\geqslant 1}^R(C, M) = 0 = \operatorname{Ext}_R^{\geqslant 1}(C, C \otimes_R M)$.

Proposition 2.7. *Assume that* $[C_n] \lhd \cdots \lhd [C_1] \lhd [C_0]$ *is a chain in* $\mathfrak{G}_0(R)$ *such that* $\mathfrak{G}_{C_1}(R) \subseteq \mathfrak{G}_{C_2}(R) \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \mathfrak{G}_{C_n}(R)$.

(1) [14, Lemma 4.3] *For each* i, p, $1 \leqslant i \leqslant i + p \leqslant n$

$$B_{\{i, i+1, \cdots, i+p\}} \cong \operatorname{Hom}_R(C_{i-1}, C_{i+p}).$$

(2) [14, Lemma 4.4] *If* $1 \leqslant i < j - 1 \leqslant n - 1$*, then*

$$B_{\{i,j\}} \cong \operatorname{Hom}_R(\operatorname{Hom}_R(B_i, C_{j-1}), C_j).$$

(3) [14, Lemma 4.5] *For each sequence* $\mathbf{i} = \{i_1, \cdots, i_j\} \subseteq [n]$*, the* R*-module* $B_{\mathbf{i}}$ *is a semidualizing.*
(4) [14, Lemma 4.6] *If* $\mathbf{i} = \{i_1, \cdots, i_j\} \subseteq [n]$ *and* $\mathbf{s} = \{s_1, \cdots, s_t\} \subseteq [n]$ *are two sequences with* $\mathbf{s} \subseteq \mathbf{i}$*, then* $[B_{\mathbf{i}}] \trianglelefteq [B_{\mathbf{s}}]$ *and* $\operatorname{Hom}_R(B_{\mathbf{s}}, B_{\mathbf{i}}) \cong B_{\mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{s}}$.
(5) [14, Theorem 4.11] *If* $\mathbf{i} = \{i_1, \cdots, i_j\} \subseteq [n]$ *and* $\mathbf{s} = \{s_1, \cdots, s_t\} \subseteq [n]$ *are two sequences, then the following conditions are equivalent.*
   (i) $B_{\mathbf{i}} \in \mathcal{A}_{B_{\mathbf{s}}}(R)$.
   (ii) $B_{\mathbf{s}} \in \mathcal{A}_{B_{\mathbf{i}}}(R)$.
   (iii) *The* R*-module* $B_{\mathbf{i}} \otimes_R B_{\mathbf{s}}$ *is semidualizing.*
   (iv) $\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{s} = \emptyset$.

At the end of this section we recall the definition of trivial extension ring. Note that this notion is the main key in the proof of the converse of Sharp's result [16], which is given by Foxby [4] and Reiten [13].

2.8. For an R-module M, the *trivial extension* of R by M is the ring $R \ltimes M$, described as follows. As an R-module, we have $R \ltimes M = R \oplus M$. The multiplication is defined by $(r, m)(r', m') = (rr', rm' + r'm)$. Note that the composition $R \to R \ltimes M \to R$ of the natural homomorphisms is the identity map of R.

Note that, for a semidualizing R-module C, the trivial extension ring $R \ltimes C$ is a commutative noetherian local ring. If R is Cohen-Macaulay then $R \ltimes C$ is Cohen-Macaulay too. For more information about the trivial extension rings one may see, e.g., [11, Section 2].

3. Results

This section is devoted to the main result, Theorem 3.9, which extends the results of Jorgensen et. al. [11, Theorem 3.2] and of Foxby [4] and Reiten [13].

For a semidualizing R-module C, set $(-)^{\dagger_C} = \mathrm{Hom}_R(-, C)$. The following notations are taken from [14].

Definition 3.1. Let $[C_n] \lhd \cdots \lhd [C_1] \lhd [C_0]$ be a chain in $\mathfrak{G}_0(R)$ of length n. For each sequence of integers $\mathbf{i} = \{i_1, \cdots, i_j\}$ such that $j \geqslant 0$ and $1 \leqslant i_1 < \cdots < i_j \leqslant n$, set $C_{\mathbf{i}} = C_0^{\dagger_{C_{i_1}} \dagger_{C_{i_2}} \cdots \dagger_{C_{i_j}}}$. (When $j = 0$, set $C_{\mathbf{i}} = C_\emptyset = C_0$).

We say that the above chain is *suitable* if $C_0 = R$ and $C_{\mathbf{i}}$ is totally C_t-reflexive, for all $\mathbf{i}$ and t with $i_j \leqslant t \leqslant n$.

Note that if $[C_n] \lhd \cdots \lhd [C_1] \lhd [R]$ is a suitable chain, then $C_{\mathbf{i}}$ is a semidualizing R-module for each $\mathbf{i} \subseteq [n]$. Also, for each sequence of integers $\{x_1, \cdots, x_m\}$ with $1 \leqslant x_1 < \cdots < x_m \leqslant n$, the sequence $[C_{x_m}] \lhd \cdots \lhd [C_{x_1}] \lhd [R]$ is a suitable chain in $\mathfrak{G}_0(R)$ of length m.

Sather-Wagstaff, in [14, Theorem 3.3], proves that if $\mathfrak{G}_0(R)$ admits a chain $[C_n] \lhd \cdots \lhd [C_1] \lhd [C_0]$ such that $\mathfrak{G}_{C_0}(R) \subseteq \mathfrak{G}_{C_1}(R) \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \mathfrak{G}_{C_n}(R)$, then $|\mathfrak{G}_0(R)| \geqslant 2^n$. Indeed, the classes $[C_{\mathbf{i}}]$, which are parameterized by the allowable sequences $\mathbf{i}$, are precisely the 2^n classes constructed in the proof of [14, Theorem 3.3].

Theorem 3.2. [14, Theorem 4.7] *Let $\mathfrak{G}_0(R)$ admit a chain $[C_n] \lhd \cdots \lhd [C_1] \lhd [C_0]$ such that $\mathfrak{G}_{C_1}(R) \subseteq \mathfrak{G}_{C_2}(R) \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \mathfrak{G}_{C_n}(R)$. If $C_0 = R$, then the R-modules $B_{\mathbf{i}}$ are precisely the 2^n semidualizing modules constructed in* [14, Theorem 3.3].

Remark 3.3. In Proposition 2.7 and Theorem 3.2, if we replace the assumption of existence of a chain $[C_n] \lhd \cdots \lhd [C_1] \lhd [C_0]$ in $\mathfrak{G}_0(R)$ such that $\mathfrak{G}_{C_1}(R) \subseteq \mathfrak{G}_{C_2}(R) \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \mathfrak{G}_{C_n}(R)$ by the existence of a suitable chain, then the assertions hold true as well.

The next lemma and proposition give us sufficient tools to treat Theorem 3.9.

Lemma 3.4. *Assume that R admits a suitable chain $[C_n] \lhd \cdots \lhd [C_1] \lhd [C_0] = [R]$ in $\mathfrak{G}_0(R)$. Then for any $k \in [n]$, there exists a suitable chain*

$$[C_n] \lhd \cdots \lhd [C_{k+1}] \lhd [C_k] \lhd [C_1^{\dagger_{C_k}}] \lhd \cdots \lhd [C_{k-2}^{\dagger_{C_k}}] \lhd [C_{k-1}^{\dagger_{C_k}}] \lhd [R] \tag{3.1}$$

in $\mathfrak{G}_0(R)$ of length n.

Proof. For i, j, $0 \leqslant j < i \leqslant k$, as $[C_i] \lhd [C_j]$ one has $[C_j^{\dagger_{C_k}}] \lhd [C_i^{\dagger_{C_k}}]$. As $[C_k] \neq [C_i^{\dagger_{C_k}}]$, one gets $[C_t] \lhd [C_i^{\dagger_{C_k}}]$ for each t, $k \leqslant t \leqslant n$. Thus (3.1) is a chain in $\mathfrak{G}_0(R)$ of length n.

Next, we show that (3.1) is a suitable chain. For $r, t \in \{0, 1, \cdots, n\}$ and a sequence $\{x_1, \cdots, x_m\}$ of integers with $r \leqslant x_1 < \cdots < x_m \leqslant t$, repeated use of Theorem 2.4 implies

$$C_r^{\dagger_{C_t}} \cong C_r^{\dagger_{C_{x_1}}} \otimes_R C_{x_1}^{\dagger_{C_{x_2}}} \otimes_R \cdots \otimes_R C_{x_m}^{\dagger_{C_t}}.$$

For each r, $0 < r < k$, set $C'_r = C_r^{\dagger_{C_k}}$. If $\mathbf{i} = \{i_1, \cdots, i_j\}$ and $\mathbf{u} = \{u_1, \cdots, u_s\}$ are sequences of integers such that $j, s \geqslant 0$ and $1 \leqslant i_j < \cdots < i_1 < k \leqslant u_1 < \cdots < u_s \leqslant n$, then we set

$$C_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{u}} = C_0^{\dagger_{C'_{i_1}} \cdots \dagger_{C'_{i_j}} \dagger_{C_{u_1}} \cdots \dagger_{C_{u_s}}}.$$

When $s=0$ (resp., $j=0$ or $j=0=s$) we have $C_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{u}}=C_{\mathbf{i},\emptyset}$ (resp., $C_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{u}}=C_{\emptyset,\mathbf{u}}$ or $C_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{u}}=C_{\emptyset,\emptyset}=C_0$).

By Proposition 2.7(4) and Remark 3.3, one has $C_0^{\dagger_{C'_{i_1}}\dagger_{C'_{i_2}}}\cong \mathrm{Hom}_R(C_{i_1}^{\dagger_{C_k}},C_{i_2}^{\dagger_{C_k}})\cong C_{i_2}^{\dagger_{C_{i_1}}}$ and so $C_0^{\dagger_{C'_{i_1}}\dagger_{C'_{i_2}}\dagger_{C'_{i_3}}}\cong \mathrm{Hom}_R(C_{i_2}^{\dagger_{C_{i_1}}},C_{i_3}^{\dagger_{C_k}})\cong C_{i_3}^{\dagger_{C_{i_2}}}\otimes_R C_{i_1}^{\dagger_{C_k}}$. By proceeding in this way one obtains the following isomorphism

$$C_0^{\dagger_{C'_{i_1}}\cdots\dagger_{C'_{i_j}}}\cong\begin{cases} C_{i_j}^{\dagger_{C_{i_{j-1}}}}\otimes_R C_{i_{j-2}}^{\dagger_{C_{i_{j-3}}}}\otimes_R\cdots\otimes_R C_{i_2}^{\dagger_{C_{i_1}}} & \text{if } j \text{ is even,}\\ C_{i_j}^{\dagger_{C_{i_{j-1}}}}\otimes_R C_{i_{j-2}}^{\dagger_{C_{i_{j-3}}}}\otimes_R\cdots\otimes_R C_{i_1}^{\dagger_{C_k}} & \text{if } j \text{ is odd.}\end{cases}\tag{3.2}$$

Therefore, by Proposition 2.7(2) and Remark 3.3,

$$C_0^{\dagger_{C'_{i_1}}\cdots\dagger_{C'_{i_j}}}\cong\begin{cases} C_0^{\dagger_{C_{i_j}}\cdots\dagger_{C_{i_1}}} & \text{if } j \text{ is even,}\\ C_0^{\dagger_{C_{i_j}}\cdots\dagger_{C_{i_1}}\dagger_{C_k}} & \text{if } j \text{ is odd,}\end{cases}$$

and thus

$$C_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{u}}\cong\begin{cases} C_0^{\dagger_{C_{i_j}}\cdots\dagger_{C_{i_1}}\dagger_{C_{u_1}}\cdots\dagger_{C_{u_s}}} & \text{if } j \text{ is even,}\\ C_0^{\dagger_{C_{i_j}}\cdots\dagger_{C_{i_1}}\dagger_{C_k}\dagger_{C_{u_1}}\cdots\dagger_{C_{u_s}}} & \text{if } j \text{ is odd.}\end{cases}$$

Hence, by assumption, $[C_t]\trianglelefteq[C_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{u}}]$ for all t, $t\geqslant u_s$. If $s=0$, then $C_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{u}}=C_{\mathbf{i},\emptyset}=C_0^{\dagger_{C'_{i_1}}\cdots\dagger_{C'_{i_j}}}$. On the other hand, for each l, $1\leqslant l\leqslant i_j$, we have

$$C_l^{\dagger_{C_k}}\cong C_l^{\dagger_{C_{i_j}}}\otimes_R C_{i_j}^{\dagger_{C_{i_{j-1}}}}\otimes_R\cdots\otimes_R C_{i_3}^{\dagger_{C_{i_2}}}\otimes_R C_{i_2}^{\dagger_{C_{i_1}}}\otimes_R C_{i_1}^{\dagger_{C_k}}.$$

Thus, by Proposition 2.7(4) and (3.2), $[C_l^{\dagger_{C_k}}]\trianglelefteq[C_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{u}}]$. Hence the chain (3.1) is suitable. □

Remark 3.5. Let R be Cohen-Macaulay and $[C_n]\lhd\cdots\lhd[C_1]\lhd[C_0]$ be a suitable chain in $\mathfrak{G}_0(R)$. For any k, $1\leqslant k\leqslant n$, set $R_k=R\ltimes C_{k-1}^{\dagger_{C_k}}$ the trivial extension of R by $C_{k-1}^{\dagger_{C_k}}$. Then R_k is totally $C_l^{\dagger_{C_k}}$-reflexive and totally C_t-reflexive R-module for all l,t with $1\leqslant l<k\leqslant t\leqslant n$. Set

$$C_l^{(k)}=\begin{cases}\mathrm{Hom}_R(R_k,C_{k-1-l}^{\dagger_{C_k}}) & \text{if } 0\leqslant l<k-1\\ \mathrm{Hom}_R(R_k,C_{l+1}) & \text{if } k-1\leqslant l\leqslant n-1\,.\end{cases}$$

Then, by Remark 2.2, $C_l^{(k)}$ is a semidualizing R_k-module for all l, $0\leqslant l\leqslant n-1$.

Proposition 3.6. *Under the hypotheses of Remark 3.5, for all k, $1\leqslant k\leqslant n$,*

$$[C_{n-1}^{(k)}]\lhd\cdots\lhd[C_1^{(k)}]\lhd[R_k]$$

is a suitable chain in $\mathfrak{G}_0(R_k)$ of length $n-1$.

Proof. Let $k\in[n]$. For integers a,b with $a\neq b$ and $0\leqslant a,b\leqslant n-1$, we observe that $[C_a^{(k)}]\neq[C_b^{(k)}]$. Indeed, we consider the three cases $0\leqslant a,b<k-1$, $0\leqslant a<k-1\leqslant b\leqslant n-1$, and $k-1\leqslant a,b\leqslant n-1$. We only discuss about the first case. The other cases are treated in a similar way. For $0\leqslant a,b<k-1$, if $[C_a^{(k)}]=[C_b^{(k)}]$, then $\mathrm{Hom}_R(R_k,C_{k-1-a}^{\dagger_{C_k}})\cong\mathrm{Hom}_R(R_k,C_{k-1-b}^{\dagger_{C_k}})$

and so $\mathrm{Hom}_{R_k}(R,\mathrm{Hom}_R(R_k,C_{k-1-a}^{\dagger_{C_k}}))\cong\mathrm{Hom}_{R_k}(R,\mathrm{Hom}_R(R_k,C_{k-1-b}^{\dagger_{C_k}}))$. Thus, by adjointness, $C_{k-1-a}^{\dagger_{C_k}}\cong C_{k-1-b}^{\dagger_{C_k}}$, which contradicts with (3.1) in Lemma 3.4.

In order to proceed with the proof, for an R_k-module M, we invent the symbol $(-)^{\dagger_M^k}=\mathrm{Hom}_{R_k}(-,M)$. Note that, for R_k-modules $M_1,\cdots,M_t$, we have

$$(-)^{\dagger_{M_1}^k\dagger_{M_2}^k\cdots\dagger_{M_t}^k}=\Big(\Big(\big((-)^{\dagger_{M_1}^k}\big)^{\dagger_{M_2}^k}\Big)^{\cdots}\Big)^{\dagger_{M_t}^k}=\mathrm{Hom}_{R_k}\big((-)^{\dagger_{M_1}^k\dagger_{M_2}^k\cdots\dagger_{M_{t-1}}^k},M_t\big).$$

For two sequences of integers $\mathbf{p}=\{p_1,\cdots,p_r\}$ and $\mathbf{q}=\{q_1,\cdots,q_s\}$ such that $r,s\geqslant 0$ and $0<p_1<\cdots<p_r<k-1\leqslant q_1<\cdots<q_s\leqslant n-1$, set

$$C_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}}^{(k)}=R_k^{\dagger_{C_{p_1}^{(k)}}^k\cdots\dagger_{C_{p_r}^{(k)}}^k\dagger_{C_{q_1}^{(k)}}^k\cdots\dagger_{C_{q_s}^{(k)}}^k}.$$

Therefore one gets the following R-module isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned}
C_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}}^{(k)} &= \mathrm{Hom}_{R_k}(\cdots\mathrm{Hom}_{R_k}(\mathrm{Hom}_{R_k}(\cdots\mathrm{Hom}_{R_k}(R_k,C_{p_1}^{(k)})\cdots,C_{p_r}^{(k)}),C_{q_1}^{(k)})\cdots,C_{q_s}^{(k)})\\
&\cong \mathrm{Hom}_R(\cdots\mathrm{Hom}_R(\mathrm{Hom}_R(\cdots\mathrm{Hom}_R(R_k,C_{k-1-p_1}^{\dagger_{C_k}})\cdots,C_{k-1-p_r}^{\dagger_{C_k}}),C_{q_1+1})\cdots,C_{q_s+1})\\
&\cong R^{\dagger_{C'_{k-1-p_1}}\cdots\dagger_{C'_{k-1-p_r}}\dagger_{C_{q_1+1}}\cdots\dagger_{C_{q_s+1}}}\oplus R^{\dagger_{C'_{k-1}}\dagger_{C'_{k-1-p_1}}\cdots\dagger_{C'_{k-1-p_r}}\dagger_{C_{q_1+1}}\cdots\dagger_{C_{q_s+1}}}\\
&= C_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{u}}\oplus C_{\mathbf{i}',\mathbf{u}}\,,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{i}=\{k-1-p_1,\cdots,k-1-p_r\}$, $\mathbf{i}'=\{k-1,k-1-p_1,\cdots,k-1-p_r\}$, $\mathbf{u}=\{q_1+1,\cdots,q_s+1\}$, $C'_l=C_l^{\dagger_{C_k}}$, for all $0<l<k$, and $C_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{u}}$ and $C_{\mathbf{i}',\mathbf{u}}$ are as in the proof of Lemma 3.4.

As $[C_{t+1}]\trianglelefteq[C_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{u}}]$ and $[C_{t+1}]\trianglelefteq[C_{\mathbf{i}',\mathbf{u}}]$ in $\mathfrak{G}_0(R)$ for all t, $q_s\leqslant t\leqslant n-1$, one gets $[C_t^{(k)}]\trianglelefteq[C_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}}^{(k)}]$ in $\mathfrak{G}_0(R_k)$, by [2, Theorem 6.5]. When $s=0$ we have $C_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}}^{(k)}=C_{\mathbf{p},\emptyset}^{(k)}\cong C_{\mathbf{i},\emptyset}\oplus C_{\mathbf{i}',\emptyset}$. By Lemma 3.4, for all m, $p_r\leqslant m<k-1$, one has $[C_{k-1-m}^{\dagger_{C_k}}]\trianglelefteq[C_{\mathbf{i},\emptyset}]$ and $[C_{k-1-m}^{\dagger_{C_k}}]\trianglelefteq[C_{\mathbf{i}',\emptyset}]$ in $\mathfrak{G}_0(R)$. Thus, by [2, Theorem 6.5], one gets $[C_m^{(k)}]\trianglelefteq[C_{\mathbf{p},\emptyset}^{(k)}]$ in $\mathfrak{G}_0(R_k)$. Hence $[C_{n-1}^{(k)}]\triangleleft\cdots\triangleleft[C_1^{(k)}]\triangleleft[R_k]$ is a suitable chain in $\mathfrak{G}_0(R_k)$ of length $n-1$. □

To state our main result, we recall the definitions of Tate homology and Tate cohomology (see [1] and [11] for more details).

Definition 3.7. Let M be a finite R-module. A *Tate resolution* of M is a diagram $\mathbf{T}\xrightarrow{\vartheta}\mathbf{P}\xrightarrow{\pi}M$, where π is an R-projective resolution of M, $\mathbf{T}$ is an exact complex of projectives such that $\mathrm{Hom}_R(T,R)$ is exact, ϑ is a morphism, and ϑ_i is isomorphism for all $i\gg 0$.

By [1, Theorem 3.1], a finite R-module has finite G-dimension if and only if it admits a Tate resolution.

Definition 3.8. Let M be a finite R-module of finite G-dimension, and let $\mathbf{T}\xrightarrow{\vartheta}\mathbf{P}\xrightarrow{\pi}M$ be a Tate resolution of M. For each integer i and each R-module N, the ith *Tate homology* and *Tate cohomology* modules are

$$\widehat{\mathrm{Tor}}_i^R(M,N)=\mathrm{H}_i(\mathbf{T}\otimes_R N)\qquad\qquad \widehat{\mathrm{Ext}}_R^i(M,N)=\mathrm{H}_{-i}(\mathrm{Hom}_R(\mathbf{T},N)).$$

Theorem 3.9. *Let R be a Cohen-Macaulay ring with a dualizing module D. Assume that R admits a suitable chain $[C_n]\triangleleft\cdots\triangleleft[C_1]\triangleleft[R]$ in $\mathfrak{G}_0(R)$ and that $C_n\cong D$. Then there exist a Gorenstein local ring Q and ideals $I_1,\cdots,I_n$ of Q, which satisfy the following conditions. In this situation, for each $\Lambda\subseteq[n]$, set $R_\Lambda=Q/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda}I_l)$, in particular $R_\emptyset=Q$.*

(1) *There is a ring isomorphism* $R \cong Q/(I_1 + \cdots + I_n)$.
(2) *For each* $\Lambda \subseteq [n]$ *with* $\Lambda \neq \emptyset$, *the ring* R_Λ *is non-Gorenstein Cohen-Macaulay with a dualizing module.*
(3) *For each* $\Lambda \subseteq [n]$ *with* $\Lambda \neq \emptyset$, *we have* $\bigcap_{l\in\Lambda} I_l = \prod_{l\in\Lambda} I_l$.
(4) *For subsets* Λ, Γ *of* $[n]$ *with* $\Gamma \subsetneq \Lambda$, *we have* $\operatorname{G-dim}_{R_\Gamma} R_\Lambda = 0$, *and* $\operatorname{Hom}_{R_\Gamma}(R_\Lambda, R_\Gamma)$ *is a non-free semidualizing* R_Λ*-module.*
(5) *For subsets* Λ, Γ *of* $[n]$ *with* $\Lambda \neq \Gamma$, *the module* $\operatorname{Hom}_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(R_\Lambda, R_\Gamma)$ *is not cyclic and*
$$\operatorname{Ext}^{\geqslant 1}_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(R_\Lambda, R_\Gamma) = 0 = \operatorname{Tor}^{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}_{\geqslant 1}(R_\Lambda, R_\Gamma).$$
(6) *For subsets* Λ, Γ *of* $[n]$ *with* $|\Lambda \setminus \Gamma| = 1$, *we have*
$$\widehat{\operatorname{Ext}}^{i}_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(R_\Lambda, R_\Gamma) = 0 = \widehat{\operatorname{Tor}}_{i}^{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(R_\Lambda, R_\Gamma)$$
for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$.

The ring Q is constructed as an iterated trivial extension of R. As an R-module, it has the form $Q = \oplus_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq[n]} B_{\mathbf{i}}$. The details are contained in the following construction.

Construction 3.10. We construct the ring Q by induction on n. We claim that the ring Q, as an R-module, has the form $Q = \oplus_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq[n]} B_{\mathbf{i}}$ and the ring structure on it is as follows.
For two elements $\big(\alpha_{\mathbf{i}}\big)_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq[n]}$ and $\big(\theta_{\mathbf{i}}\big)_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq[n]}$ of Q
$$\big(\alpha_{\mathbf{i}}\big)_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq[n]}\big(\theta_{\mathbf{i}}\big)_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq[n]} = \big(\sigma_{\mathbf{i}}\big)_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq[n]}\ , \text{ where } \quad \sigma_{\mathbf{i}} = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{v}\subseteq\mathbf{i}\\ \mathbf{w}=\mathbf{i}\setminus\mathbf{v}}} \alpha_{\mathbf{v}}\cdot\theta_{\mathbf{w}}\,.$$

For $n = 1$, set $Q = R \ltimes C_1$ and $I_1 = 0 \oplus C_1$, which is the result of Foxby [4] and Reiten [13]. The case $n = 2$ is proved by Jorgensen et. al. [11, Theorem 3.2]. They proved that the extension ring Q has the form $Q = R\oplus C_1 \oplus C_1^{\dagger_{C_2}} \oplus C_2$ as an R-module (i.e. $Q = B_\emptyset \oplus B_1 \oplus B_2 \oplus B_{\{1,2\}}$). Also the ring structure on Q is given by $(r, c, f, d)(r', c', f', d') = (rr', rc' + r'c, rf' + r'f, f'(c) + f(c') + rd' + r'd)$. The ideal I_l, $l = 1, 2$, has the form $I_l = 0 \oplus 0 \oplus B_l \oplus B_{\{1,2\}}$.

Let $n > 2$. Take an element $k \in [n]$. By Proposition 3.6, the ring $R_k = R \ltimes C_{k-1}^{\dagger_{C_k}}$ has the suitable chain $[C_{n-1}^{(k)}] \lhd \cdots \lhd [C_1^{(k)}] \lhd [R_k]$ in $\mathfrak{G}_0(R_k)$ of length $n-1$. Note that $C_{n-1}^{(k)} = \operatorname{Hom}_R(R_k, C_n) \cong \operatorname{Hom}_R(R_k, D)$ is a dualizing R_k-module.

We set $B_i^{(k)} = \operatorname{Hom}_{R_k}(C_{i-1}^{(k)}, C_i^{(k)})$, $i = 1, \cdots, n-1$. For two sequences $\mathbf{p} = \{p_1, \cdots, p_r\}$, $\mathbf{q} = \{q_1, \cdots, q_s\}$ such that $r, s \geqslant 1$ and $1 \leqslant p_1 < \cdots < p_r < k-1 \leqslant q_1 < \cdots < q_s \leqslant n-1$, we set
$$B^{(k)}_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}} = B^{(k)}_{p_1} \otimes_{R_k} \cdots \otimes_{R_k} B^{(k)}_{p_r} \otimes_{R_k} B^{(k)}_{q_1} \otimes_{R_k} \cdots \otimes_{R_k} B^{(k)}_{q_s}, \tag{3.3}$$
$$B^{(k)}_{\mathbf{p},\emptyset} = B^{(k)}_{p_1} \otimes_{R_k} \cdots \otimes_{R_k} B^{(k)}_{p_r},\ \ B^{(k)}_{\emptyset,\mathbf{q}} = B^{(k)}_{q_1} \otimes_{R_k} \cdots \otimes_{R_k} B^{(k)}_{q_s},\ \text{ and }\ B^{(k)}_{\emptyset,\emptyset} = C_0^{(k)} = R_k.$$
By applying the induction hypothesis on R_k there is an extension ring, say Q_k, which is Gorenstein local and, as an R_k-module, has the form
$$Q_k = \bigoplus_{\substack{\mathbf{p}\subseteq\{1,\cdots,k-2\}\\ \mathbf{q}\subseteq\{k-1,\cdots,n-1\}}} B^{(k)}_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}}\ .$$

Moreover, the ring structure on Q_k is as follows.
For $\phi=\big(\phi_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}}\big)_{\mathbf{p}\subseteq\{1,\cdots,k-2\},\ \mathbf{q}\subseteq\{k-1,\cdots,n-1\}}$ and $\varphi=\big(\varphi_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}}\big)_{\mathbf{p}\subseteq\{1,\cdots,k-2\},\ \mathbf{q}\subseteq\{k-1,\cdots,n-1\}}$ of Q_k

$$\phi\,\varphi=\psi=\big(\psi_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}}\big)_{\mathbf{p}\subseteq\{1,\cdots,k-2\},\ \mathbf{q}\subseteq\{k-1,\cdots,n-1\}}\ ,\ \text{where}\quad \psi_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}}=\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{a}\subseteq\mathbf{p},\,\mathbf{b}\subseteq\mathbf{q}\\ \mathbf{c}=\mathbf{p}\setminus\mathbf{a}\\ \mathbf{d}=\mathbf{q}\setminus\mathbf{b}}}\phi_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}\cdot\varphi_{\mathbf{c},\mathbf{d}}\,. \tag{3.4}$$

For each $\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}$, Proposition 2.7(2), Remark 3.3 and (3.3) imply the following R-module isomorphism

$$B^{(k)}_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}}\cong\begin{cases} B_{\{k-p_r,\cdots,k-p_1,q_1+1,\cdots,q_s+1\}}\oplus B_{\{k-p_r,\cdots,k-p_1,k,q_1+1,\cdots,q_s+1\}},\\ \text{or}\\ B_{\{1,k-p_r,\cdots,k-p_1,q_2+1,\cdots,q_s+1\}}\oplus B_{\{1,k-p_r,\cdots,k-p_1,k,q_2+1,\cdots,q_s+1\}}.\end{cases} \tag{3.5}$$

Therefore one gets an R-module isomorphism $Q_k\cong\oplus_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq[n]}B_{\mathbf{i}}$. Set $Q=Q_k$.

Assume that $\mathbf{p},\mathbf{p}'\subseteq\{1,\cdots,k-2\}$ and $\mathbf{q},\mathbf{q}'\subseteq\{k-1,\cdots,n-1\}$ such that $\mathbf{p}\cap\mathbf{p}'=\emptyset$ and $\mathbf{q}\cap\mathbf{q}'=\emptyset$. By Proposition 2.7(5) and Remark 3.3, the R_k-module $B^{(k)}_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}}\otimes_{R_k}B^{(k)}_{\mathbf{p}',\mathbf{q}'}$ is a semidualizing and so $B^{(k)}_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}}\otimes_{R_k}B^{(k)}_{\mathbf{p}',\mathbf{q}'}=B^{(k)}_{\mathbf{p}\cup\mathbf{p}',\mathbf{q}\cup\mathbf{q}'}$. If $\phi_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}}\in B^{(k)}_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}}$ and $\varphi_{\mathbf{p}',\mathbf{q}'}\in B^{(k)}_{\mathbf{p}',\mathbf{q}'}$, then by the isomorphism (3.5), one has $\phi_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}}=(\beta_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}},\gamma_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}})$ and $\varphi_{\mathbf{p}',\mathbf{q}'}=(\beta_{\mathbf{p}',\mathbf{q}'},\gamma_{\mathbf{p}',\mathbf{q}'})$, so that

$$\phi_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}}\cdot\varphi_{\mathbf{p}',\mathbf{q}'}=(\beta_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}}\cdot\beta_{\mathbf{p}',\mathbf{q}'},\ \beta_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}}\cdot\gamma_{\mathbf{p}',\mathbf{q}'}+\beta_{\mathbf{p}',\mathbf{q}'}\cdot\gamma_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}}).$$

Thus by means of the ring structure on Q_k, (3.4), one can see that the resulting ring structure on Q is as claimed.

The next step is to introduce the ideals $I_1,\cdots,I_n$. We set $I_l=(\underbrace{0\oplus\cdots\oplus 0}_{2^{n-1}})\oplus(\oplus_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq[n],\,l\in\mathbf{i}}B_{\mathbf{i}})$, $1\leqslant l\leqslant n$, which is an ideal of Q. Also we have the following sequence of R-isomorphisms which preserve ring isomorphisms:

$$\begin{aligned} Q/(I_1+\cdots+I_n) &= (\oplus_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq[n]}B_{\mathbf{i}})/(\Sigma_{l=1}^{n}(\underbrace{0\oplus\cdots\oplus 0}_{2^{n-1}})\oplus(\oplus_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq[n],\,l\in\mathbf{i}}B_{\mathbf{i}}))\\ &\cong (\oplus_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq[n]}B_{\mathbf{i}})/(\oplus_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq[n],\mathbf{i}\neq\emptyset}B_{\mathbf{i}})\\ &\cong R\,. \end{aligned}$$

Note that each ideal $I_{k,l}$, $1\leqslant l\leqslant n-1$, of Q_k has the form $I_{k,l}=(\underbrace{0\oplus\cdots\oplus 0}_{2^{n-2}})\oplus(\oplus_{l\in\mathbf{p}\cup\mathbf{q}}B^{(k)}_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}})$. Then, by (3.5), one has the following R-module isomorphism

$$I_{k,l}\cong\begin{cases} I_{k-l} & \text{if}\ \ 1\leqslant l\leqslant k-1\\ I_{l+1} & \text{if}\ \ k\leqslant l\leqslant n-1.\end{cases}$$

Also, by means of the ring isomorphism $Q_k\to Q$, we have the natural correspondence between ideals:

$$I_{k,l}\xleftrightarrow{\text{correspond}}\begin{cases} I_{k-l} & \text{if}\ \ 1\leqslant l\leqslant k-1\\ I_{l+1} & \text{if}\ \ k\leqslant l\leqslant n-1.\end{cases}$$

Therefore for each $\Lambda\subseteq[n]\setminus\{k\}$, there is a ring isomorphism $Q/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda}I_l)\cong Q_k/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda'}I_{k,l})$, for some $\Lambda'\subseteq[n-1]$.

The proof of Theorem 3.9, which is inspired by the proof of [11, Theorem 3.2], is rather technical and needs some preparatory lemmas.

Lemma 3.11. *Assume that $\Lambda \subseteq [n]$. Under the hypothesis of Theorem 3.9, if $[n]\setminus\Lambda = \{b_1, \cdots, b_t\}$ with $1 \leqslant b_1 < \cdots < b_t \leqslant n$, then there is an R-isomorphism*

$$R_{_\Lambda} \cong \oplus_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq\{b_1,\cdots,b_t\}} B_{\mathbf{i}}$$

which induces a ring structure on $R_{_\Lambda}$ as follows.

For elements $\big(\alpha_{\mathbf{i}}\big)_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq\{b_1,\cdots,b_t\}}$ and $\big(\theta_{\mathbf{i}}\big)_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq\{b_1,\cdots,b_t\}}$ of $R_{_\Lambda}$

$$\big(\alpha_{\mathbf{i}}\big)_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq\{b_1,\cdots,b_t\}}\big(\theta_{\mathbf{i}}\big)_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq\{b_1,\cdots,b_t\}} = \big(\sigma_{\mathbf{i}}\big)_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq\{b_1,\cdots,b_t\}}\ ,\ \textit{where}\qquad \sigma_{\mathbf{i}} = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{v}\subseteq\mathbf{i}\\ \mathbf{w}=\mathbf{i}\setminus\mathbf{v}}} \alpha_{\mathbf{v}}\cdot\theta_{\mathbf{w}}\,.$$

Proof. We prove by induction on n. The case $n = 1$ is clear. The case $n = 2$ is proved in [11]. Assume that $n > 2$ and the assertion holds true for $n-1$.

If $\Lambda = [n]$, there is nothing to prove. Suppose that $|\Lambda| \leqslant n-1$ then there exists $k \in [n]$ such that $\Lambda \subseteq [n]\setminus\{k\}$. Thus, by Construction 3.10, there exists a subset Λ' of $[n-1]$ such that $R_{_\Lambda} \cong Q_k/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda'} I_{k,l})$ as ring isomorphism.

Note that $|[n-1]\setminus\Lambda'| = t-1$. Set $[n-1]\setminus\Lambda' = \{d_1, \cdots, d_u, d_{u+1}, \cdots, d_{t-1}\}$ such that $1 \leqslant d_1 < \cdots < d_u < k-1$ and $k-1 \leqslant d_{u+1} < \cdots < d_{t-1} \leqslant n-1$. Then by induction there exists an R_k-isomorphism

$$Q_k/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda'} I_{k,l}) \cong \bigoplus_{\substack{\mathbf{p}\subseteq\{d_1,\cdots,d_u\}\\ \mathbf{q}\subseteq\{d_{u+1},\cdots,d_{t-1}\}}} B^{(k)}_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}}.$$

Proceeding as Construction 3.10, there is an R-isomorphism

$$\Big(\bigoplus_{\substack{\mathbf{p}\subseteq\{d_1,\cdots,d_u\}\\ \mathbf{q}\subseteq\{d_{u+1},\cdots,d_{t-1}\}}} B^{(k)}_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}}\Big) \cong \Big(\bigoplus_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq\{b_1,\cdots,b_t\}} B_{\mathbf{i}}\Big).$$

Therefore one has an R-isomorphism $R_{_\Lambda} \cong \oplus_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq\{b_1,\cdots,b_t\}} B_{\mathbf{i}}$. Similar to Construction 3.10, $R_{_\Lambda}$ has the desired ring structure. □

Lemma 3.12. *Under the hypothesis of Theorem 3.9, if $\Gamma \subsetneq \Lambda \subseteq [n]$, then $\operatorname{Ext}^{\geqslant 1}_{R_{_\Gamma}}(R_{_\Lambda}, R_{_\Gamma}) = 0$ and $\operatorname{Hom}_{R_{_\Gamma}}(R_{_\Lambda}, R_{_\Gamma})$ is a non-free semidualizing $R_{_\Lambda}$-module.*

Proof. The case $n = 1$ is clear and the case $n = 2$ is proved in [11, Lemma 3.8]. Let $n > 2$ and suppose that the assertion is settled for $n-1$.

First assume that $\Lambda = [n]$. Set $[n]\setminus\Gamma = \{a_1, \cdots, a_s\}$ with $1 \leqslant a_1 < \cdots < a_s \leqslant n$. By Lemma 3.11, $R_{_\Gamma} \cong \oplus_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}} B_{\mathbf{i}}$. By Proposition 2.7(4) and Remark 3.3, $[B_{\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}}] \trianglelefteq [B_{\mathbf{i}}]$ and $\operatorname{Hom}_R(B_{\mathbf{i}}, B_{\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}}) \cong B_{\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}\setminus\mathbf{i}}$, for all $\mathbf{i} \subseteq \{a_1, \cdots, a_s\}$. Therefore there are R-isomorphisms

$$\operatorname{Hom}_R(R_{_\Gamma}, B_{\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}}) \cong \operatorname{Hom}_R(\oplus_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}} B_{\mathbf{i}}, B_{\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}}) \cong \oplus_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}} B_{\mathbf{i}} \cong R_{_\Gamma}$$

and, for all $i \geqslant 1$,

$$\operatorname{Ext}^i_R(R_{_\Gamma}, B_{\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}}) \cong \operatorname{Ext}^i_R(\oplus_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}} B_{\mathbf{i}}, B_{\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}}) = 0.$$

Let $\mathbf{E}$ be an injective resolution of $B_{\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}}$ as an R-module. Thus $\mathrm{Hom}_R(R_\Gamma,\mathbf{E})$ is an injective resolution of R_Γ as an R_Γ-module. Note that the composition of natural homomorphisms $R\to R_\Gamma\to R$ is the identity id_R. Therefore

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{R_\Gamma}(R,\mathrm{Hom}_R(R_\Gamma,\mathbf{E}))\cong\mathrm{Hom}_R(R\otimes_{R_\Gamma}R_\Gamma,\mathbf{E})\cong\mathrm{Hom}_R(R,\mathbf{E})\cong\mathbf{E}\,.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Ext}^i_{R_\Gamma}(R,R_\Gamma) &\cong \mathrm{H}^i(\mathrm{Hom}_{R_\Gamma}(R,\mathrm{Hom}_R(R_\Gamma,\mathbf{E})))\\ &\cong \mathrm{H}^i(\mathbf{E})\\ &\cong \begin{cases}0 & \text{if } i>0\\ B_{\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}} & \text{if } i=0\,.\end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

As $\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}\neq\emptyset$, the R-module $B_{\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}}$ is a non-free semidualizing.

Now assume that $|\Lambda|\leqslant n-1$. There exist $k\in[n]$, and subsets Γ', Λ' of $[n-1]$ such that there are R-isomorphisms and ring isomorphisms $R_\Gamma\cong Q_k/(\Sigma_{l\in\Gamma'}I_{k,l})$ and $R_\Lambda\cong Q_k/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda'}I_{k,l})$, where Q_k and $I_{k,l}$ are as in Construction 3.10. By induction we have

$$\mathrm{Ext}^i_{R_\Gamma}(R_\Lambda,R_\Gamma)\cong\mathrm{Ext}^i_{Q_k/(\Sigma_{l\in\Gamma'}I_{k,l})}(Q_k/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda'}I_{k,l}),Q_k/(\Sigma_{l\in\Gamma'}I_{k,l}))=0$$

for all $i\geqslant 1$, and

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{R_\Gamma}(R_\Lambda,R_\Gamma)\cong\mathrm{Hom}_{Q_k/(\Sigma_{l\in\Gamma'}I_{k,l})}(Q_k/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda'}I_{k,l}),Q_k/(\Sigma_{l\in\Gamma'}I_{k,l}))$$

is a non-free semidualizing $Q_k/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda'}I_{k,l})$-module. Then $\mathrm{Hom}_{R_\Gamma}(R_\Lambda,R_\Gamma)$ is a non-free semidualizing R_Λ-module. □

Lemma 3.13. *Under the hypothesis of Theorem 3.9, if Λ and Γ are two subsets of $[n]$, then $\mathrm{Tor}^{R_{\Lambda\cup\Gamma}}_{\geqslant 1}(R_\Lambda,R_\Gamma)=0$. Moreover, there is an R_Λ-algebra isomorphism $R_\Lambda\otimes_{R_{\Lambda\cup\Gamma}}R_\Gamma\cong R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}$.*

Proof. We prove by induction. If $n=1$, there is nothing to prove. The case $n=2$ is proved in [11, Lemma 3.9]. Let $n>2$ and suppose that the assertion holds true for $n-1$. First assume that $\Lambda\cup\Gamma=[n]$ and set $[n]\setminus\Lambda=\{b_1,\cdots,b_t\}$, $[n]\setminus\Gamma=\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}$. Then $[n]\setminus(\Lambda\cap\Gamma)=\{b_1,\cdots,b_t,a_1,\cdots,a_s\}$. By Lemma 3.11, $R_\Lambda\cong\oplus_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq\{b_1,\cdots,b_t\}}B_{\mathbf{i}}$ and $R_\Gamma\cong\oplus_{\mathbf{u}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}}B_{\mathbf{u}}$.

As $\{b_1,\cdots,b_t\}\cap\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}=\emptyset$, for each $\mathbf{i}\subseteq\{b_1,\cdots,b_t\}$ and $\mathbf{u}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}$, by Proposition 2.7(5) and Remark 3.3, one has $B_{\mathbf{i}}\in\mathcal{A}_{B_{\mathbf{u}}}(R)$ and so $\mathrm{Tor}^R_{\geqslant 1}(B_{\mathbf{i}},B_{\mathbf{u}})=0$. Hence $\mathrm{Tor}^R_{\geqslant 1}(R_\Lambda,R_\Gamma)=0$.

By Proposition 2.7(5) and Remark 3.3, the R-module $B_{\mathbf{i}}\otimes_R B_{\mathbf{u}}$ is semidualizing and so $B_{\mathbf{i}}\otimes_R B_{\mathbf{u}}=B_{\mathbf{i}\cup\mathbf{u}}$. Therefore one has the natural R-module isomorphism

$$\eta:R_\Lambda\otimes_R R_\Gamma\longrightarrow R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}\,,\qquad \eta\big((\alpha_{\mathbf{i}})_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq\{b_1,\cdots,b_t\}}\otimes(\theta_{\mathbf{u}})_{\mathbf{u}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}}\big)=\big(\alpha_{\mathbf{i}}.\theta_{\mathbf{u}}\big)_{\substack{\mathbf{i}\subseteq\{b_1,\cdots,b_t\}\\ \mathbf{u}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}}}$$

It is routine to check that η is also a ring isomorphism.

On the other hand the natural maps

$$\zeta:R_\Lambda\to R_\Lambda\otimes_R R_\Gamma\,,\qquad \zeta\big((\alpha_{\mathbf{i}})_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq\{b_1,\cdots,b_t\}}\big)=(\alpha_{\mathbf{i}})_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq\{b_1,\cdots,b_t\}}\otimes(\dot{\theta}_{\mathbf{u}})_{\mathbf{u}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}}$$

and

$$\varepsilon:R_\Lambda\to R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}\,,\qquad \varepsilon((\alpha_{\mathbf{i}})_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq\{b_1,\cdots,b_t\}})=(\chi_{\mathbf{v}})_{\mathbf{v}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s,b_1,\cdots,b_t\}}\,,$$

where $\dot{\theta}_{\mathbf{u}}=\begin{cases}0 & \text{if } \mathbf{u}\neq\emptyset\\ 1 & \text{if } \mathbf{u}=\emptyset\end{cases}$ and $\chi_{\mathbf{v}}=\begin{cases}\alpha_{\mathbf{v}} & \text{if } \mathbf{v}\cap\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}=\emptyset\\ 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{v}\cap\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}\neq\emptyset\,,\end{cases}$

are ring homomorphism. It is easy to check that $\eta\zeta=\varepsilon$. Hence $R_{_\Lambda}\otimes_R R_{_\Gamma}\xrightarrow{\eta}R_{_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}$ is an $R_{_\Lambda}$-algebra isomorphism.

Now let $\Lambda\cup\Gamma\subsetneq[n]$, then, by Construction 3.10, there exist $k\in[n]$ and $\Lambda',\Gamma'\subseteq[n-1]$ such that there are R-isomorphisms and ring isomorphisms

$$R_{_\Lambda}\cong Q_k/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda'}I_{k,l})\,,\qquad R_{_\Gamma}\cong Q_k/(\Sigma_{l\in\Gamma'}I_{k,l})$$

$$R_{_{\Lambda\cup\Gamma}}\cong Q_k/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda'\cup\Gamma'}I_{k,l})\,,\ \text{and}\quad R_{_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}\cong Q_k/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda'\cap\Gamma'}I_{k,l})\,.$$

Thus, by induction, for all $i\geqslant 1$

$$\operatorname{Tor}_i^{R_{\Lambda\cup\Gamma}}(R_{_\Lambda},R_{_\Gamma})\cong\operatorname{Tor}_i^{Q_k/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda'\cup\Gamma'}I_{k,l})}(Q_k/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda'}I_{k,l}),Q_k/(\Sigma_{l\in\Gamma'}I_{k,l}))=0$$

and there is $Q_k/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda'}I_{k,l})$-algebra isomorphism and so $R_{_\Lambda}$-algebra isomorphism as follows

$$\begin{aligned}R_{_\Lambda}\otimes_{R_{_{\Lambda\cup\Gamma}}}R_{_\Gamma}&\cong Q_k/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda'}I_{k,l})\otimes_{Q_k/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda'\cup\Gamma'}I_{k,l})}Q_k/(\Sigma_{l\in\Gamma'}I_{k,l})\\&\cong Q_k/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda'\cap\Gamma'}I_{k,l})\\&\cong R_{_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}\,.\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 3.14. *Under the hypothesis of Theorem 3.9, if Λ and Γ are two subsets of $[n]$, then $\operatorname{Tor}_{\geqslant 1}^{R_{_\Lambda}}(R_{_{\Lambda\cup\Gamma}},R_{_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}})=0$. Moreover, there is an $R_{_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}$-module isomorphism $R_{_{\Lambda\cup\Gamma}}\otimes_{R_{_\Lambda}}R_{_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}\cong R_{_\Gamma}$.*

Proof. It is proved by induction on n. If $n=1$, there is nothing to prove. The case $n=2$ is proved in [11, Lemma 3.11]. Let $n>2$ and suppose that the assertion holds true for $n-1$.

First assume that $\Lambda\cup\Gamma=[n]$. Let $\mathbf{P}$ be an R-projective resolution of $R_{_\Gamma}$. Lemma 3.13 implies that $R_{_\Lambda}\otimes_R\mathbf{P}$ is an $R_{_\Lambda}$-projective resolution of $R_{_\Lambda}\otimes_R R_{_\Gamma}\cong R_{_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}$. One has the following natural isomorphisms

$$R\otimes_{R_{_\Lambda}}(R_{_\Lambda}\otimes_R\mathbf{P})\cong(R\otimes_{R_{_\Lambda}}R_{_\Lambda})\otimes_R\mathbf{P}\cong R\otimes_R\mathbf{P}\cong\mathbf{P}$$

and then, for all $i\geqslant 1$,

$$\operatorname{Tor}_i^{R_{_\Lambda}}(R,R_{_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}})\cong\mathrm{H}_i(R\otimes_{R_{_\Lambda}}(R_{_\Lambda}\otimes_R\mathbf{P}))\cong\mathrm{H}_i(\mathbf{P})=0\,.$$

Set $[n]\setminus\Lambda=\{b_1,\cdots,b_t\}$ and $[n]\setminus\Gamma=\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}$. Then $[n]\setminus(\Lambda\cap\Gamma)=\{b_1,\cdots,b_t,a_1,\cdots,a_s\}$. Consider the R-module isomorphism $\xi:R_{_\Gamma}\xrightarrow{\cong}R\otimes_{R_{_\Lambda}}R_{_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}$ which is the composition

$$R_{_\Gamma}\xrightarrow{\cong}R\otimes_R R_{_\Gamma}\xrightarrow{\cong}R\otimes_{R_{_\Lambda}}(R_{_\Lambda}\otimes_R R_{_\Gamma})\xrightarrow[R\otimes\eta]{\cong}R\otimes_{R_{_\Lambda}}R_{_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}$$

given by

$$\begin{aligned}(\theta_{\mathbf{u}})_{\mathbf{u}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}}\ \mapsto\ 1\otimes(\theta_{\mathbf{u}})_{\mathbf{u}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}}&\mapsto 1\otimes[(\dot{\alpha}_{\mathbf{i}})_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq\{b_1,\cdots,b_t\}}\otimes(\theta_{\mathbf{u}})_{\mathbf{u}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}}]\\&\mapsto 1\otimes(\lambda_{\mathbf{v}})_{\mathbf{v}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s,b_1,\cdots,b_t\}}\,,\end{aligned}$$

where $\dot{\alpha}_{\mathbf{i}}=\begin{cases}0 & \text{if } \mathbf{i}\neq\emptyset\\ 1 & \text{if } \mathbf{i}=\emptyset\end{cases}$ and $\lambda_{\mathbf{v}}=\begin{cases}\theta_{\mathbf{v}} & \text{if } \mathbf{v}\cap\{b_1,\cdots,b_t\}=\emptyset\\ 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{v}\cap\{b_1,\cdots,b_t\}\neq\emptyset\end{cases}$.

We claim that ξ is an $R_{_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}$-module isomorphism.

Proof of the claim: The $R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}$-module structure of R_Γ, which is given via the natural surjection $R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma} \to R_\Gamma$, is described as

$$(\gamma_{\mathbf{v}})_{\mathbf{v}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s,b_1,\cdots,b_t\}}(\theta_{\mathbf{u}})_{\mathbf{u}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}} = (\gamma_{\mathbf{u}})_{\mathbf{u}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}}(\theta_{\mathbf{u}})_{\mathbf{u}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}},$$

where $(\gamma_{\mathbf{v}})_{\mathbf{v}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s,b_1,\cdots,b_t\}}$ is an element of $R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}$. In the following we check that

$$\xi\big((\gamma_{\mathbf{v}})_{\mathbf{v}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s,b_1,\cdots,b_t\}}(\theta_{\mathbf{u}})_{\mathbf{u}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}}\big) = (\gamma_{\mathbf{v}})_{\mathbf{v}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s,b_1,\cdots,b_t\}}[\xi((\theta_{\mathbf{u}})_{\mathbf{u}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}})].$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\xi\big((\gamma_{\mathbf{v}})_{\mathbf{v}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s,b_1,\cdots,b_t\}}(\theta_{\mathbf{u}})_{\mathbf{u}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}}\big) &= \xi((\gamma_{\mathbf{u}})_{\mathbf{u}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}}(\theta_{\mathbf{u}})_{\mathbf{u}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}})\\ &= \xi\big((\sigma_{\mathbf{u}})_{\mathbf{u}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}}\big)\\ &= 1\otimes(\mu_{\mathbf{v}})_{\mathbf{v}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s,b_1,\cdots,b_t\}},\end{aligned}$$

where $(\sigma_{\mathbf{u}})_{\mathbf{u}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}} = (\gamma_{\mathbf{u}})_{\mathbf{u}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}}(\theta_{\mathbf{u}})_{\mathbf{u}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}}$ and $\mu_{\mathbf{v}} = \begin{cases}\sigma_{\mathbf{v}} & \text{if } \mathbf{v}\cap\{b_1,\cdots,b_t\}=\emptyset\\ 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{v}\cap\{b_1,\cdots,b_t\}\neq\emptyset\end{cases}$.

On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned}(\gamma_{\mathbf{v}})_{\mathbf{v}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s,b_1,\cdots,b_t\}}[\xi((\theta_{\mathbf{u}})_{\mathbf{u}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}})] &= (\gamma_{\mathbf{v}})_{\mathbf{v}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s,b_1,\cdots,b_t\}}[1\otimes(\lambda_{\mathbf{v}})_{\mathbf{v}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s,b_1,\cdots,b_t\}}]\\ &= 1\otimes[(\gamma_{\mathbf{v}})_{\mathbf{v}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s,b_1,\cdots,b_t\}}(\lambda_{\mathbf{v}})_{\mathbf{v}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s,b_1,\cdots,b_t\}}]\\ &= 1\otimes(\varrho_{\mathbf{v}})_{\mathbf{v}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s,b_1,\cdots,b_t\}}\\ &= [1\otimes(\mu_{\mathbf{v}})_{\mathbf{v}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s,b_1,\cdots,b_t\}}]+[1\otimes\delta],\end{aligned}$$

where $\delta = (\delta_{\mathbf{v}})_{\mathbf{v}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s,b_1,\cdots,b_t\}}$ with $\delta_{\mathbf{v}} = \begin{cases}0 & \text{if } \mathbf{v}\cap\{b_1,\cdots,b_t\}=\emptyset\\ \varrho_{\mathbf{v}} & \text{if } \mathbf{v}\cap\{b_1,\cdots,b_t\}\neq\emptyset\end{cases}$.

It is enough to show that $1\otimes\delta = 0$. To this end, we have

$$1\otimes\delta = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{w}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s,b_1,\cdots,b_t\}\\ \mathbf{w}\cap\{b_1,\cdots,b_t\}\neq\emptyset}} 1\otimes\delta(\mathbf{w}),$$

where $\delta(\mathbf{w}) = \big(\delta(\mathbf{w})_{\mathbf{v}}\big)_{\mathbf{v}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s,b_1,\cdots,b_t\}}$ with $\delta(\mathbf{w})_{\mathbf{v}} = \begin{cases}0 & \text{if } \mathbf{v}\neq\mathbf{w}\\ \delta_{\mathbf{w}} & \text{if } \mathbf{v}=\mathbf{w}\end{cases}$. For each $\mathbf{w}$ there exist $\mathbf{w}'\subseteq\{b_1,\cdots,b_t\}$ and $\mathbf{w}''\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s\}$ with $\mathbf{w}'\cup\mathbf{w}''=\mathbf{w}$. Thus $B_{\mathbf{w}'}\otimes_R B_{\mathbf{w}''}\overset{\rho_{\mathbf{w}}}{\cong} B_{\mathbf{w}}$ and there exist $\delta'_{\mathbf{w}}\in B_{\mathbf{w}'}$ and $\delta''_{\mathbf{w}}\in B_{\mathbf{w}''}$ such that $\delta_{\mathbf{w}} = \rho_{\mathbf{w}}(\delta'_{\mathbf{w}}\otimes\delta''_{\mathbf{w}})$.

Set $\alpha(\mathbf{w}) = \big(\alpha(\mathbf{w})_{\mathbf{i}}\big)_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq\{b_1,\cdots,b_t\}}$, where $\alpha(\mathbf{w})_{\mathbf{i}} = \begin{cases}0 & \text{if } \mathbf{i}\neq\mathbf{w}'\\ \delta'_{\mathbf{w}} & \text{if } \mathbf{i}=\mathbf{w}'\end{cases}$. As the R_Λ-module structure on R is given via the natural surjection $R_\Lambda \longrightarrow R$, and $\alpha(\mathbf{w})$ is an element of the kernel of this map, $0\oplus(\oplus_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq\{b_1,\cdots,b_t\},\mathbf{i}\neq\emptyset}B_{\mathbf{i}})$, we have $1\,\alpha(\mathbf{w}) = 0$. Set $\beta(\mathbf{w}) = \big(\beta(\mathbf{w})_{\mathbf{v}}\big)_{\mathbf{v}\subseteq\{a_1,\cdots,a_s,b_1,\cdots,b_t\}}$, where $\beta(\mathbf{w})_{\mathbf{v}} = \begin{cases}0 & \text{if } \mathbf{v}\neq\mathbf{w}''\\ \delta''_{\mathbf{w}} & \text{if } \mathbf{v}=\mathbf{w}''\end{cases}$. Note that $\beta(\mathbf{w})$ is an element of $R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}$ and $\delta(\mathbf{w}) = \alpha(\mathbf{w})\beta(\mathbf{w})$. Then

$$1\otimes\delta = \sum_{\mathbf{w}} 1\otimes\delta(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{\mathbf{w}} 1\otimes[\alpha(\mathbf{w})\beta(\mathbf{w})] = \sum_{\mathbf{w}}[1\alpha(\mathbf{w})]\otimes\beta(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{\mathbf{w}} 0\otimes\beta(\mathbf{w}) = 0.$$

Therefore the claim is proved and also the assertion holds in the case $\Lambda\cup\Gamma = [n]$.

We treat the case $\Lambda\cup\Gamma\subsetneq[n]$ by induction and its details are similar to the proof of Lemma 3.13. □

Proof of Theorem 3.9. (1) is proved in Construction 3.10.

(2). It is proved by induction on n. The case $n = 1$ is clear by assumptions. Let $n > 1$ and the claim is settled for $n-1$. If $\Lambda = [n]$, then $R_\Lambda \cong R$ and is Cohen-Macaulay with the dualizing module D and is not Gorenstein. Let $\Lambda \subsetneq [n]$. There exists $k \in [n]$ such that $\Lambda \subseteq [n] \setminus \{k\}$. By Construction 3.10, there exists a subset $\Lambda' \neq \emptyset$ of $[n-1]$ such that $R_\Lambda \cong Q_k/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda'} I_{k,l})$ as ring isomorphism. Thus, by induction, R_Λ is non-Gorenstein Cohen-Macaulay ring with dualizing module.

(3). It is clear that $\prod_{l\in\Lambda} I_l \subseteq \bigcap_{l\in\Lambda} I_l$. Let $\alpha = \big(\alpha_{\mathbf{i}}\big)_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq[n]}$ be an element of $\bigcap_{l\in\Lambda} I_l$. Then, by Construction 3.10, $\alpha_{\mathbf{i}} = 0$ for all $\mathbf{i} \subseteq [n]$ with $\Lambda \nsubseteq \mathbf{i}$. We have $\alpha = \sum_{\Lambda\subseteq\mathbf{v}\subseteq[n]} \alpha(\mathbf{v})$, where $\alpha(\mathbf{v}) = \big(\alpha(\mathbf{v})_{\mathbf{i}}\big)_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq[n]}$ with $\alpha(\mathbf{v})_{\mathbf{i}} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{v} \\ \alpha_{\mathbf{v}} & \text{if } \mathbf{i} = \mathbf{v} \end{cases}$. Set $\Lambda = \{a_1, \cdots, a_m\}$. If $\mathbf{v} \subseteq [n]$ such that $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbf{v}$, then $\mathbf{v} = \{a_1\} \cup \{a_2\} \cup \cdots \cup \{a_{m-1}\} \cup (\mathbf{v} \setminus \{a_1, \cdots, a_{m-1}\})$. Thus

$$B_{\mathbf{v}} \overset{\Phi}{\cong} B_{\{a_1\}} \otimes_R \cdots \otimes_R B_{\{a_{m-1}\}} \otimes_R B_{\mathbf{v}\setminus\{a_1,\cdots,a_{m-1}\}}.$$

Therefore there exist $\theta_{\mathbf{v},m} \in B_{\mathbf{v}\setminus\{a_1,\cdots,a_{m-1}\}}$ and $\theta_{\mathbf{v},r} \in B_{\{a_r\}}$, $1 \leqslant r < m$, such that $\alpha_{\mathbf{v}} = \Phi(\theta_{\mathbf{v},1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \theta_{\mathbf{v},m-1} \otimes \theta_{\mathbf{v},m})$. Set $\varphi(\mathbf{v}, r) = \big(\varphi(\mathbf{v}, r)_{\mathbf{i}}\big)_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq[n]}$, $1 \leqslant r \leqslant m$, where, for $1 \leqslant r < m$,

$$\varphi(\mathbf{v}, r)_{\mathbf{i}} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{i} \neq \{a_r\} \\ \theta_{\mathbf{v},r} & \text{if } \mathbf{i} = \{a_r\} \end{cases} \text{ and } \varphi(\mathbf{v}, m)_{\mathbf{i}} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{v} \setminus \{a_1, \cdots, a_{m-1}\} \\ \theta_{\mathbf{v},m} & \text{if } \mathbf{i} = \mathbf{v} \setminus \{a_1, \cdots, a_{m-1}\}. \end{cases}$$

Note that $\varphi(\mathbf{v}, r) \in I_{a_r}$, $1 \leqslant r \leqslant m$. Hence $\varphi(\mathbf{v}, 1) \cdots \varphi(\mathbf{v}, m-1)\varphi(\mathbf{v}, m) \in \prod_{l\in\Lambda} I_l$. On the other hand $\varphi(\mathbf{v}, 1) \cdots \varphi(\mathbf{v}, m-1)\varphi(\mathbf{v}, m) = \alpha(\mathbf{v})$. Thus $\alpha(\mathbf{v})$ is an element of $\prod_{l\in\Lambda} I_l$ and so $\alpha \in \prod_{l\in\Lambda} I_l$.

(4) is followed by Remark 2.2 and Lemma 3.12.

(5). Let $\mathbf{P}$ be a projective resolution of $R_{\Lambda\cup\Gamma}$ over R_Λ. Lemma 3.14 implies that the complex $\mathbf{P} \otimes_{R_\Lambda} R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}$ is a $R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}$-projective resolution of $R_{\Lambda\cup\Gamma} \otimes_{R_\Lambda} R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma} \cong R_\Gamma$. From the isomorphisms

$$(\mathbf{P} \otimes_{R_\Lambda} R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}) \otimes_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}} R_\Lambda \cong \mathbf{P} \otimes_{R_\Lambda} R_\Lambda \cong \mathbf{P}$$

one gets

$$\operatorname{Tor}_i^{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(R_\Gamma, R_\Lambda) \cong \mathrm{H}_i((\mathbf{P} \otimes_{R_\Lambda} R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}) \otimes_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}} R_\Lambda) \cong \mathrm{H}_i(\mathbf{P}) = 0\,.$$

for all $i \geqslant 1$. There is a natural isomorphism $R_\Lambda \otimes_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}} R_\Gamma \cong R_{\Lambda\cup\Gamma}$ which is both $R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}$- and R_Γ-isomorphism.

Let $\mathbf{P'}$ be an $R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}$-projective resolution of R_Λ. As seen in the above, $\mathbf{P'} \otimes_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}} R_\Gamma$ is a projective resolution of $R_{\Lambda\cup\Gamma}$ over R_Γ. Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Ext}^i_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(R_\Lambda, R_\Gamma) &\cong \mathrm{H}^i(\operatorname{Hom}_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(\mathbf{P'}, R_\Gamma) \\ &\cong \mathrm{H}^i(\operatorname{Hom}_{R_\Gamma}(\mathbf{P'} \otimes_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}} R_\Gamma, R_\Gamma) \\ &\cong \operatorname{Ext}^i_{R_\Gamma}(R_{\Lambda\cup\Gamma}, R_\Gamma) \end{aligned}$$

for all $i \geqslant 0$. By (4), $\text{G-dim}_{R_\Gamma} R_{\Lambda\cup\Gamma} = 0$, and so one gets $\operatorname{Ext}^{\geqslant 1}_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(R_\Lambda, R_\Gamma) = 0$. Also, by (4), $\operatorname{Hom}_{R_\Gamma}(R_{\Lambda\cup\Gamma}, R_\Gamma)$ is a non-free semidualizing $R_{\Lambda\cup\Gamma}$-module and thus $\operatorname{Hom}_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(R_\Lambda, R_\Gamma)$ is not cyclic.

(6). As $R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}=Q/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda\cap\Gamma}I_l)$ and $R_\Lambda=Q/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda}I_l)\cong R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda}I_l/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda\cap\Gamma}I_l))$, one has the natural isomorphism

$$\kappa:\operatorname{Hom}_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(R_\Lambda,R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma})\longrightarrow\big(0:_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda}I_l/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda\cap\Gamma}I_l)\big),\quad \kappa(\psi)=\psi(\dot\alpha),$$

where $\dot\alpha=(\dot\alpha_{\mathbf{i}})_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq[n]\setminus\Lambda}$ with $\dot\alpha_{\mathbf{i}}=\begin{cases}0 & \text{if } \mathbf{i}\neq\emptyset\\ 1 & \text{if } \mathbf{i}=\emptyset\end{cases}$ is the identity element of R_Λ.

Next we show that $\big(0:_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda}I_l/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda\cap\Gamma}I_l)\big)=\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda}I_l/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda\cap\Gamma}I_l)$. Set $\Lambda\setminus\Gamma=\{a\}$. Let $\gamma=(\gamma_{\mathbf{i}})_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq[n]\setminus\Lambda\cap\Gamma}$ be an element of $\big(0:_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda}I_l/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda\cap\Gamma}I_l)\big)$. If $\gamma\notin\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda}I_l/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda\cap\Gamma}I_l)$, then there exists $\mathbf{v}\subseteq[n]\setminus\Lambda\cap\Gamma$ such that $a\notin\mathbf{v}$ and $\gamma_{\mathbf{v}}\neq0$. Set $M=R\gamma_{\mathbf{v}}$, which is a non-zero submodule of $B_{\mathbf{v}}$. As B_a is a semidualizing R-module and $M\neq0$, we have $B_a\otimes_R M\neq0$. Thus there exists an element e of B_a such that $e\otimes\gamma_{\mathbf{v}}\neq0$. Set $\theta=(\theta_{\mathbf{i}})_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq[n]\setminus\Lambda\cap\Gamma}$, where $\theta_{\mathbf{i}}=\begin{cases}0 & \text{if } \mathbf{i}\neq\{a\}\\ e & \text{if } \mathbf{i}=\{a\}\end{cases}$. Note that θ is an element of $\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda}I_l/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda\cap\Gamma}I_l)$ and $\gamma\theta\neq0$, which contradicts with $\gamma\in\big(0:_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda}I_l/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda\cap\Gamma}I_l)\big)$. Therefore

$$\big(0:_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda}I_l/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda\cap\Gamma}I_l)\big)\subseteq\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda}I_l/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda\cap\Gamma}I_l).$$

On the other hand $\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda}I_l/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda\cap\Gamma}I_l)\subseteq\big(0:_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda}I_l/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda\cap\Gamma}I_l)\big)$. Indeed, if $\alpha=(\alpha_{\mathbf{i}})_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq[n]\setminus\Lambda\cap\Gamma}$ and $\alpha'=(\alpha'_{\mathbf{i}})_{\mathbf{i}\subseteq[n]\setminus\Lambda\cap\Gamma}$ are two elements of $\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda}I_l/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda\cap\Gamma}I_l)$, then $\alpha_{\mathbf{i}}=0=\alpha'_{\mathbf{i}}$ for all $\mathbf{i}$ such that $a\notin\mathbf{i}$. Hence, by Lemma 3.11, $\alpha\alpha'=0$. Thus

$$\kappa:\operatorname{Hom}_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(R_\Lambda,R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma})\longrightarrow\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda}I_l/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda\cap\Gamma}I_l),\quad \kappa(\psi)=\psi(\dot\alpha)\tag{3.6}$$

is an $R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}$-isomorphism.

By (4), $\text{G-dim}_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}R_\Lambda=0$. Let $\mathbf{F}$ be a minimal free resolution of R_Λ over $R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}$. Note that $\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda}I_l/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda\cap\Gamma}I_l)$ is the first syzygy of R_Λ in $\mathbf{F}$. By [1, Construction 3.6] and (3.6), we can construct a Tate resolution of R_Λ as $\mathbf{T}\to\mathbf{F}\to R_\Lambda$, where $\mathbf{T}$ construct by splicing $\mathbf{F}$ with $\operatorname{Hom}_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(\mathbf{F},R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma})$. Hence $\mathbf{T}\cong\operatorname{Hom}_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(\mathbf{T},R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma})$. This explains the first isomorphism in the next sequence

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\operatorname{Tor}}_i^{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(R_\Lambda,R_\Gamma) &= \operatorname{H}_i\big(\mathbf{T}\otimes_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}R_\Gamma\big)\\ &\cong \operatorname{H}_i\big(\operatorname{Hom}_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(\mathbf{T},R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma})\otimes_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}R_\Gamma\big)\\ &\cong \operatorname{H}_i\big(\operatorname{Hom}_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(\mathbf{T},R_\Gamma)\big)\\ &= \widehat{\operatorname{Ext}}^{-i}_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(R_\Lambda,R_\Gamma)\end{aligned}\tag{3.7}$$

for all $i\in\mathbb{Z}$. As each $R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}$-module $\mathbf{T}_i$ is finite and free, the second isomorphism follows.

By (4), $\text{G-dim}_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}R_\Lambda=0$ and so, by [1, Theorem 5.2], one has

$$\widehat{\operatorname{Tor}}_i^{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(R_\Lambda,R_\Gamma)\cong\operatorname{Tor}_i^{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(R_\Lambda,R_\Gamma)\quad\text{and}\quad\widehat{\operatorname{Ext}}^{i}_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(R_\Lambda,R_\Gamma)\cong\operatorname{Ext}^{i}_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(R_\Lambda,R_\Gamma)\tag{3.8}$$

for all $i\geqslant1$. Thus, by (3.7), (3.8) and (5), one gets

$$\widehat{\operatorname{Ext}}^{-i}_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(R_\Lambda,R_\Gamma)\cong\widehat{\operatorname{Tor}}_i^{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(R_\Lambda,R_\Gamma)\cong\operatorname{Tor}_i^{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(R_\Lambda,R_\Gamma)=0\,,$$

$$\widehat{\operatorname{Tor}}_{-i}^{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(R_\Lambda,R_\Gamma)\cong\widehat{\operatorname{Ext}}^{i}_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(R_\Lambda,R_\Gamma)\cong\operatorname{Ext}^{i}_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(R_\Lambda,R_\Gamma)=0$$

for all $i \geqslant 1$. Therefore, by (3.7), to complete the proof it is enough to show that $\widehat{\operatorname{Ext}}^{0}_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(R_\Lambda, R_\Gamma) = 0$. As $\widehat{\operatorname{Ext}}^{-1}_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(R_\Lambda, R_\Gamma) = 0$ and R_Λ is totally reflexive as an $R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}$-module one has, by [1, Lemma 5.8], the exact sequence

$$0 \to \operatorname{Hom}_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(R_\Lambda, R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}) \otimes_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}} R_\Gamma \xrightarrow{\nu} \operatorname{Hom}_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(R_\Lambda, R_\Gamma) \longrightarrow \widehat{\operatorname{Ext}}^{0}_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(R_\Lambda, R_\Gamma) \to 0\,, \tag{3.9}$$

where the map ν is given by

$$\nu(\psi \otimes \theta) = \psi_\theta\,, \quad \psi_\theta(\alpha) = \psi(\alpha)\theta\,.$$

In a similar way to (3.6), one gets the natural isomorphism $\tau : \operatorname{Hom}_{R_\Gamma}(R_{\Lambda\cup\Gamma}, R_\Gamma) \longrightarrow \Sigma_{l\in\Lambda\cup\Gamma} I_l/(\Sigma_{l\in\Gamma} I_l)$ given by $\tau(\psi) = \psi(\dot{\varphi})$, where $\dot{\varphi}$ is the identity element of $R_{\Lambda\cup\Gamma}$. It is straightforward to show that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\operatorname{Hom}_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(R_\Lambda, R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}) \otimes_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}} R_\Gamma & & \xrightarrow{\qquad\qquad\nu\qquad\qquad} & & \operatorname{Hom}_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(R_\Lambda, R_\Gamma) \\
\kappa \otimes R_\Gamma \big\downarrow \cong & & & & f \big\downarrow \cong \\
\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda} I_l/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda\cap\Gamma} I_l) \otimes_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}} R_\Gamma & \xrightarrow[g]{\cong} & I_a/(\Sigma_{l\in\Gamma} I_a I_l) & \xrightarrow[h]{\cong} \Sigma_{l\in\Lambda\cup\Gamma} I_l/(\Sigma_{l\in\Gamma} I_l) & \xleftarrow[\tau]{\cong} \operatorname{Hom}_{R_\Gamma}(R_{\Lambda\cup\Gamma}, R_\Gamma)\,,
\end{array}$$

where the maps f, g and h are natural isomorphisms. Hence ν is surjective and (3.9) implies that $\widehat{\operatorname{Ext}}^{0}_{R_{\Lambda\cap\Gamma}}(R_\Lambda, R_\Gamma) = 0$. □

The following results give a partial converse to Theorem 3.9. Note that Proposition 3.16 is a generalization of the result of Jorgensen et. al. [11, Theorem 3.1].

Proposition 3.15. *Let R be a Cohen-Macaulay ring. Assume that there exist a Gorenstein local ring Q and ideals $I_1, \cdots, I_n$ of Q satisfying the following conditions.*

1. *There is a ring isomorphism $R \cong Q/(I_1 + \cdots + I_n)$.*
2. *The ring $R_k = Q/(I_1 + \cdots + I_k)$ is Cohen-Macaulay for all $k \in [n]$.*
3. *$\operatorname{fd}_{R_j}(R_k) < \infty$ for all $k \in [n]$ and all $1 \leqslant j \leqslant k$.*
4. *For each $k \in [n]$ and all $0 \leqslant j < k$, $\mathrm{I}^{R_k}_{R_k}(t) \neq t^e \mathrm{I}^{R_j}_{R_j}(t)$ for any integer e. ($R_0 = Q$)*

Then there exist integers $g_0, g_1, \cdots, g_{n-1}$ such that

$$[\operatorname{Ext}^{g_0}_Q(R, Q)] \lhd [\operatorname{Ext}^{g_1}_{R_1}(R, R_1)] \lhd \cdots \lhd [\operatorname{Ext}^{g_{n-1}}_{R_{n-1}}(R, R_{n-1})] \lhd [R]$$

is a chain in $\mathfrak{G}_0(R)$ of length n.

Proof. We prove by induction. For $n = 1$, it is clear that $\operatorname{Ext}^{g_0}_Q(R, Q)$ is a dualizing R-module for some integer g_0. It will be shown in following that the condition (4) implies $[\operatorname{Ext}^{g_0}_Q(R, Q)] \lhd [R]$. Let $n = 2$. As $\operatorname{fd}_{R_1}(R) < \infty$, one has $\text{G-dim}_{R_1}(R) < \infty$. Then, by Remark 2.2, there exists an integer g_1 such that $\operatorname{Ext}^i_{R_1}(R, R_1) = 0$ for all $i \neq g_1$ and $C_1 = \operatorname{Ext}^{g_1}_{R_1}(R, R_1)$ is a semidualizing R-module. Therefore there is an isomorphism $C_1 \simeq \Sigma^{g_1}\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_{R_1}(R, R_1)$ in the derived category $\mathrm{D}(R)$. Thus, by [2, (1.7.8)], $\mathrm{I}^{C_1}_R(t) = t^{-g_1}\mathrm{I}^{R_1}_{R_1}(t)$. Also there exists an integer g_0 such that $\operatorname{Ext}^i_Q(R, Q) = 0$ for all $i \neq g_0$ and $D = \operatorname{Ext}^{g_0}_Q(R, Q)$ is a dualizing R-module and then $D \simeq \Sigma^{g_0}\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_Q(R, Q)$ in $\mathrm{D}(R)$. Assumption (4) implies that C_1 is a non-trivial semidualizing R-module and so $[D] \lhd [C_1] \lhd [R]$ is a chain in $\mathfrak{G}_0(R)$ of length 2.

Let $n > 2$ and suppose that the assertion holds true for $n-1$. By induction there exist integers $h_0, h_1, \cdots, h_{n-2}$ such that

$$[\mathrm{Ext}^{h_0}_Q(R_{n-1}, Q)] \lhd [\mathrm{Ext}^{h_1}_{R_1}(R_{n-1}, R_1)] \lhd \cdots \lhd [\mathrm{Ext}^{h_{n-2}}_{R_{n-2}}(R_{n-1}, R_{n-2})] \lhd [R_{n-1}] \tag{3.10}$$

is a chain in $\mathfrak{G}_0(R_{n-1})$ of length $n-1$. (In fact, there is an isomorphism $\mathrm{Ext}^{h_i}_{R_i}(R_{n-1}, R_i) \simeq \Sigma^{h_i}\mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_{R_i}(R_{n-1}, R_i)$ in $\mathrm{D}(R_{n-1})$ for all $0 \leqslant i \leqslant n-2$.)

As $\mathrm{fd}_{R_k}(R) < \infty$, one has $\text{G-dim}_{R_k}(R) < \infty$ for all $k \in [n]$ and so, by Remark 2.2, there exists an integer g_k such that $\mathrm{Ext}^i_{R_k}(R, R_k) = 0$ for all $i \neq g_k$ and $C_k = \mathrm{Ext}^{g_k}_{R_k}(R, R_k)$ is a semidualizing R-module. We have $C_k \simeq \Sigma^{g_k}\mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_{R_k}(R, R_k)$ in $\mathrm{D}(R)$. Also there exists an integer g_0 such that $\mathrm{Ext}^i_Q(R, Q) = 0$ for all $i \neq g_0$ and $D = \mathrm{Ext}^{g_0}_Q(R, Q)$ is a dualizing for R and so $D \simeq \Sigma^{g_0}\mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_Q(R, Q)$ in $\mathrm{D}(R)$. Note that there is an isomorphism $\mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_{R_k}(R, R_k) \simeq \mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_{R_{n-1}}(R, \mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_{R_k}(R_{n-1}, R_k))$, $0 \leqslant k \leqslant n-1$, in $\mathrm{D}(R)$, and R is a finite R_{n-1}-module with $\mathrm{fd}_{R_{n-1}}(R) < \infty$. Thus, by [5, Theorem 5.7] and (3.10), one obtains $[\mathrm{Ext}^{g_{k-1}}_{R_{k-1}}(R, R_{k-1})] \trianglelefteq [\mathrm{Ext}^{g_k}_{R_k}(R, R_k)]$ for all $1 \leqslant k \leqslant n-1$. By [2, (1.7.8)], $\mathrm{I}^{C_k}_R(t) = t^{-g_k}\mathrm{I}^{R_k}_{R_k}(t)$ for all $1 \leqslant k \leqslant n-1$ and $\mathrm{I}^D_R(t) = t^{-g_0}\mathrm{I}^Q_Q(t)$. Therefore, by condition (4), $[\mathrm{Ext}^{g_{k-1}}_{R_{k-1}}(R, R_{k-1})] \lhd [\mathrm{Ext}^{g_k}_{R_k}(R, R_k)]$ for all $1 \leqslant k \leqslant n-1$, and $[\mathrm{Ext}^{g_{n-1}}_{R_{n-1}}(R, R_{n-1})] \lhd [R]$. Hence

$$[\mathrm{Ext}^{g_0}_Q(R, Q)] \lhd [\mathrm{Ext}^{g_1}_{R_1}(R, R_1)] \lhd \cdots \lhd [\mathrm{Ext}^{g_{n-1}}_{R_{n-1}}(R, R_{n-1})] \lhd [R]$$

is a chain in $\mathfrak{G}_0(R)$ of length n. □

Proposition 3.16. *Let R be a Cohen-Macaulay ring. Assume that there exist a Gorenstein local ring Q and ideals $I_1, \cdots, I_n$ of Q satisfying the following conditions.*

1. *There is a ring isomorphism $R \cong Q/(I_1 + \cdots + I_n)$.*
2. *For each $\Lambda \subseteq [n]$, the ring $R_\Lambda = Q/(\Sigma_{l\in\Lambda} I_l)$ is Cohen-Macaulay.*
3. *For subsets Λ, Γ of $[n]$ with $\Lambda \cap \Gamma = \emptyset$*
   - (i) $\mathrm{Tor}^Q_{\geqslant 1}(R_\Lambda, R_\Gamma) = 0$;
   - (ii) *For all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$,* $\widehat{\mathrm{Ext}}^i_Q(R_\Lambda, R_\Gamma) = 0 = \widehat{\mathrm{Tor}}^Q_i(R_\Lambda, R_\Gamma)$.
4. *For two subsets Λ, Γ of $[n]$ with $\Lambda \neq \Gamma$ and for any integer e, $\mathrm{I}^{R_\Lambda}_{R_\Lambda}(t) \neq t^e\mathrm{I}^{R_\Gamma}_{R_\Gamma}(t)$.*

Then, for each $\Lambda \subseteq [n]$, there is an integer g_Λ such that $\mathrm{Ext}^{g_\Lambda}_{R_\Lambda}(R, R_\Lambda)$ is a semidualizing R-module. As conclusion, R admits 2^n non-isomorphic semidualizing modules.

Proof. For two subsets Λ, Γ of $[n]$ with $\Gamma \subseteq \Lambda$, we have $\text{G-dim}_{R_\Gamma}(R_\Lambda) < \infty$. Indeed, $\text{G-dim}_Q(R_{\Lambda\setminus\Gamma}) < \infty$, since Q is Gorenstein. Thus $R_{\Lambda\setminus\Gamma}$ admits a Tate resolution $\mathbf{T} \xrightarrow{\vartheta} \mathbf{P} \xrightarrow{\pi} R_{\Lambda\setminus\Gamma}$ over Q, where ϑ_i is isomorphism for all $i \gg 0$. We show that the induced diagram $\mathbf{T} \otimes_Q R_\Gamma \xrightarrow{\vartheta\otimes_Q R_\Gamma} \mathbf{P} \otimes_Q R_\Gamma \xrightarrow{\pi\otimes_Q R_\Gamma} R_{\Lambda\setminus\Gamma} \otimes_Q R_\Gamma$ is a Tate resolution of $R_{\Lambda\setminus\Gamma} \otimes_Q R_\Gamma \cong R_\Lambda$ over R_Γ. By condition (3)(i), $\mathbf{P} \otimes_Q R_\Gamma$ is a free resolution of R_Λ over R_Γ. Also by assumption, $\widehat{\mathrm{Tor}}^Q_i(R_{\Lambda\setminus\Gamma}, R_\Gamma) = 0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and then $\mathbf{T} \otimes_Q R_\Gamma$ is an exact complex of finite free R_Γ-modules. Of course, the map $\vartheta_i \otimes_Q R_\Gamma$ is an isomorphism for all $i \gg 0$. In order to show that $\mathrm{Hom}_{R_\Gamma}(\mathbf{T} \otimes_Q R_\Gamma, R_\Gamma)$ is exact we note that the sequence of isomorphisms

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{R_\Gamma}(\mathbf{T} \otimes_Q R_\Gamma, R_\Gamma) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_Q(\mathbf{T}, \mathrm{Hom}_{R_\Gamma}(R_\Gamma, R_\Gamma)) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_Q(\mathbf{T}, R_\Gamma),$$

implies that

$$\mathrm{H}_i(\mathrm{Hom}_{R_\Gamma}(\mathbf{T}\otimes_Q R_\Gamma, R_\Gamma)) \cong \mathrm{H}_i(\mathrm{Hom}_Q(\mathbf{T}, R_\Gamma)) \cong \widehat{\mathrm{Ext}}_Q^{-i}(R_{\Lambda\setminus\Gamma}, R_\Gamma)$$

which is zero, by condition (3)(ii), for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. Hence the complex $\mathrm{Hom}_{R_\Gamma}(\mathbf{T}\otimes_Q R_\Gamma, R_\Gamma)$ is exact and so R_Λ admits a Tate resolution over R_Γ. Therefore $\text{G-dim}_{R_\Gamma}(R_\Lambda) < \infty$.

In particular, $\text{G-dim}_{R_\Lambda}(R) < \infty$ for all $\Lambda \subseteq [n]$. Hence, by Remark 2.2, $\mathrm{Ext}^i_{R_\Lambda}(R, R_\Lambda) = 0$ for all $i \neq g_\Lambda$, where $g_\Lambda := \text{G-dim}_{R_\Lambda}(R)$, and $C_\Lambda := \mathrm{Ext}^{g_\Lambda}_{R_\Lambda}(R, R_\Lambda)$ is a semidualizing R-module.

Note that there is an isomorphism $C_\Lambda \simeq \Sigma^{g_\Lambda}\mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_{R_\Lambda}(R, R_\Lambda)$ in the derived category $\mathrm{D}(R)$. Therefore, by [2, (1.7.8)],

$$\mathrm{I}_R^{C_\Lambda}(t) = \mathrm{I}_R^{\Sigma^{g_\Lambda}\mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_{R_\Lambda}(R,R_\Lambda)}(t) = t^{-g_\Lambda}\mathrm{I}_{R_\Lambda}^{R_\Lambda}(t).$$

Now the condition (4) implies that the 2^n semidualizing C_Λ are pairwise non-isomorphic. □

References

[1] L. L. Avramov and A. Martsinkovsky, *Absolute, relative, and Tate cohomology of modules of finite Gorenstein dimension*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **85** (2002), 393–440.

[2] L. W. Christensen, *Semi-dualizing complexes and their Auslander categories*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **353** (2001), 1839–1883.

[3] L. W. Christensen and S. Sather-Wagstaff, *A Cohen-Macaulay algebra has only finitely many semidualizing modules*, Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. **145** (2008), 601–603.

[4] H. B. Foxby, *Gorenstein modules and related modules*, Math. Scand. **31** (1972), 267–284.

[5] A. Frankild and S. Sather-Wagstaff, *Reflexivity and ring homomorphisms of finite flat dimension*, Comm. Algebra **35** (2007), 461–500.

[6] A. Frankild and S. Sather-Wagstaff, *The set of semidualizing complexes is a nontrivial metric space*, J. Algebra **308** (2007), 124–143.

[7] A. Gerko, *On the structure of the set of semidualizing complexes*, Illinois J. Math. **48** (2004), 965–976.

[8] E. S. Golod, *G-dimension and generalized perfect ideals*, Trudy Mat. Inst. Steklov. **165** (1984), 62-66.

[9] R. Hartshorne, *Residues and duality*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, No. 20, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1966.

[10] H. Holm and P. Jørgensen, *Semi-dualizing modules and related Gorenstein homological dimensions*, Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra **205** (2006), 423–445.

[11] D. A. Jorgensen, G. J. Leuschke, and S. Sather-Wagstaff, *Presentations of Rings with Non-Trivial Semidualizing Modules*, Collect. Math. **63** (2012), 165–180.

[12] S. Nasseh and S. Sather-Wagstaff, *A local ring has only finitely many semidualizing complexes up to shift-isomorphism*, arXiv:1201.0037v2 (2012).

[13] I. Reiten, *The converse to a theorem of Sharp on Gorenstein modules*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **32** (1972), 417–420.

[14] S. Sather-Wagstaff, *Lower bounds for the number of semidualizing complexes over a local ring*, Math. Scand. **110** (2012), 5–17.

[15] S. Sather-Wagstaff, *Semidualizing modules*, http://www.ndsu.edu/pubweb/s̃satherw/DOCS/sdm.pdf

[16] R. Y. Sharp, *Finitely generated modules of finite iniective dimension over certain Cohen-Macaulay rings*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **25** (1972), 303–328.

[17] W. V. Vasconcelos, *Divisor theory in module categories*, North-Holland Math. Stud., vol. **14**, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1974.

Ensiyeh Amanzadeh, School of Mathematics, Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM), P.O. Box: 19395-5746, Tehran, Iran; and Faculty of Mathematical Sciences and Computer, Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran.

E-mail address: en.amanzadeh@gmail.com

Mohammad T. Dibaei, Faculty of Mathematical Sciences and Computer, Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran; and School of Mathematics, Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM), P.O. Box: 19395-5746, Tehran, Iran.

E-mail address: dibaeimt@ipm.ir